



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,619	01/16/2004	Larry J. Pacey	WMS-033	8178

30223 7590 06/05/2007
NIXON PEABODY LLP
161 N. CLARK STREET
48TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60601-3213

EXAMINER

TORIMIRO, ADETOKUNBO OLUSEGUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,619	PACEY, LARRY J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adetokunbo O. Torimiro	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 March 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/06/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment received on 03/06/2007 has been considered. It has been noted that claims 1,15,29,32-33,35, and 37-40 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-28 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ainsworth (US 6,544,120).

Re claim 1,15, and 37-40: Ainsworth teaches randomly selecting a first plurality of symbols to form a first array (see **claims 1 and 17**); displaying the first array (see **figs. 1 and 4; claims 1 and 17**); determining if the first array has a first winning outcome/pay line (see **claims 1 and 17**); making a second wager / *bet* to be eligible for an award based on a second / *bonus* array (see **col.4, lines 37-39**); randomly selecting a second plurality of symbols (see **figs. 1 and 4; claim 17**); adding the second plurality of symbols to the first array to form a second array (see **figs. 1 and 4; col. 4, lines 29-36; claims 1 and 17**); displaying the second array (see **figs. 1 and 4; claims 1 and 17**); determining if the second array has a second winning outcome/pay line (see **col. 4, lines 34-37; claims 1 and 17**); and awarding an award for any winning outcome (see **col.4, lines 34-37; claims 1 and 17**), further discloses that a third or even more arrays may be played (see **figs. 1 and 4; col. 4, lines 34-37; claim 19**); providing an array of symbol positions

Art Unit: 3714

for accommodating respective symbols; offering a player an option to make a wager on an expanded array; and in response to the wager (**see col.4, 37-39**).

However, Ainsworth does not explicitly teach that a first wager is made to initiate play of the wagering game since it is/was well known in the art at the time the invention was made that wagering/slot games function or allow the user to play only after an initial wager has been made.

Re claims 2-4 and 16-18: Ainsworth teaches that the second array is at least one additional row and/or column (**see figs. 1 and 4; claim 17**).

Re claims 11-14 and 25-28: Ainsworth teaches that the additional row and/or column can randomly be determined (**see col. 4, lines 10-13; claim 17**) or the player may choose where the location is (**see col. 4, lines 13-14; claim 20**).

Re claims 5 and 19: Ainsworth teaches that the player must make additional wagers on the pay lines of the second, third, etc... arrays (**see col. 4, lines 38-40**).

Re claims 6,10,20, and 24: Ainsworth teaches that in order to receive the second array the initial array must have a triggering event (**see claims 1 and 17**).

Re claims 7-8 and 21-22: Ainsworth teaches the gaming machine with arrays.

However, Ainsworth does not teach that multiple pay tables or probability tables are used.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the initial array could use a first pay table with a maximum of a five-of-a-kind match (if there are five reels with three rows each) and that when the expanded array is used that an alternate / *second* pay table may be used that will be larger than the first pay table because now the maximum could be a six-of-a-kind match (if an additional reel was added with three rows) or any additional combinations now possible with the expanded array and that in respect with the additional combinations now possible that a second probability table can be used to determine the probabilities of the new combinations in order to make it possible for the player's to achieve additional and more rewarding payouts depending on how many bonus/additional arrays they achieve during game play.

Re claims 9 and 23: Ainsworth teaches that extending / *adding* a row and/or a column allows extra pay lines to be added to the game (**see figs. 1 and 4; col. 3, lines 61-64**).

4. Claims 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ainsworth (US 6,544,120) in view of Hughs-Baird (US 6,749,504). The teachings of Ainsworth have been discussed above.

Re claims 29,30,32,33, and 35: Ainsworth teaches the gaming machine with arrays.

However, Ainsworth does not teach that modifier symbols are used that can be added to the first array to form a second array or used to modify the array to form a modified array where the modifier symbols represent a mathematical function.

Hughs-Baird discloses a multiplier feature that in response to a primary game outcome that additional symbols which are multipliers associated with a mathematical function are placed in visual association with a symbol array and that payout multipliers are selected for the arrays and used to award greater payouts (see **figs.5A-5D; col.9, lines 38-49**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ainsworth's gaming machine with Hughs-Baird so as to allow the additional arrays to either by modifier symbols are have associated modifier symbols that correspond to the arrays in order to increase the player's excitement because they have the possibility to win even greater payouts with the multiplier symbols.

Re claims 31,34, and 36: Ainsworth teaches that in order to receive an additional array the initial array must have a triggering event (see **claims 1 and 17**).

Response to Arguments

5. The Applicants correction in regards to the objection to the Drawings and 35 USC 112 rejection is accepted therefore, that objection and rejection has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 29-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/06/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 3714

In regards to claims 1,15, and 37-39, Examiner disagrees with Applicant's argument that Ainsworth teaches separate new arrays which are not related to the original first array. According to the teaching of Ainsworth in col.4, lines 29-36, the new arrays are additional arrays, which means they are arrays added to the previous/initial array and not necessarily different. Also Examiner points out that no where in the teaching of Ainsworth states that these additional arrays are separate new arrays as argued by the Applicant.

Further in regards to claims 1,15, and 37-39, Examiner disagrees with Applicants argument that Ainsworth does not disclose making a second wager to be eligible for an award based on a second array. According to the teaching of Ainsworth in col.4, lines 37-39, the game designer has the option of betting credit/wager on the second array/bonus array. According to the Examiner's interpretation of both the claims and the prior art reference, this is an obvious option that is dependent on the game designer.

Conclusion


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Singer et al discloses a slot machine game having a plurality of ways for a user to obtain payouts for one or more additional pay lines formed of special symbols in a symbol matrix; Paulsen et al discloses a gaming device having a multiple coordinate award distributor including award percentages.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adetokunbo O. Torimiro whose telephone number is (571) 270-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am - 4pm).

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

AT


ROBERT E. PEZZUTO
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER